

REMARKS

Claims 1-15, 30-44, 59-73, 88, 90 and 92 are currently pending in this application.

Claims 16, 29, 45-58, 74-87, 89, 91, and 93 were previously cancelled. Independent claims 1, 30, 59, 88, 90 and 92 are herein amended. No new matter has been added by way of these amendments. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration in view of the above amendments and the following remarks.

1. Applicants would like to express their appreciation to the Examiner for his time and comments during the Examiner Interview held on Friday February 27, 2004. During the Examiner Interview, the proposed amendments to the independent claims were discussed. The Examiner agreed that the pending claims, as amended, appear to be patentably distinct from the art of record.

2. Each of the independent claims, that is claims 1, 30, 59, 88, 90, and 92, has been amended to require that the "multimedia component is a likeness of the sender of the multi-mail message based on stored multimedia information of the sender." Applicants respectfully submit that no new matter has been added by way of these amendments. *See e.g., inter alia*, Application at p.9, ln.7 – ln.9; p.17, ln.11 – p.18, ln.5; p.20, ln.7 – ln.12.

3. Independent claims 1, 30, and 59 have been amended to require "verifying identifier information of the sender of the multi-mail message" and "allowing access to stored

Amendment/Response dated March 1, 2004

In response to the Office Action dated December 30, 2003

multimedia information of the sender.” Independent claims 88, 90, and 92 have been amended to require code to “verify identifier information of the sender of the multi-mail message” and “allow access to stored multimedia information of the sender.” Applicants respectfully submit that no new matter has been added by way of these amendments. *See e.g., inter alia*, Application at p.9, ln.19 – p.10, ln.3; p.10, ln.8 – p.11, ln.8; p.11, ln.21 – p.12, ln.9.

4. All the pending claims, that is claims 1-15, 30-44, 59-73, 88, 90 and 92, have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable.

Claims 1-5, 30-34 and 59-63 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Johnson et al.³⁸³ (U.S. Patent 5,568,383) in view of Johnson et al.⁹¹⁰ (U.S. Patent 5,434,910) and further in view of Cosatto et al. (U.S. Patent 6,112,177).

Claims 6-9, 35-38 and 64-67 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Johnson et al.³⁸³ in view of Johnson et al.⁹¹⁰ and further in view of Cosatto et al. and further in view of Lee et al. (U.S. Patent 6,088,673).

Claims 10, 39 and 68 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Johnson et al.³⁸³ in view of Johnson et al.⁹¹⁰ and further in view of Cosatto et al.

Claims 11-12, 40-41 and 69-70 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Johnson et al.³⁸³ in view of Johnson et al.⁹¹⁰ and further in view of Cosatto et al. and further in view of Lee et al.

Claims 13, 42 and 71 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Johnson et al.³⁸³ in view of Johnson et al.⁹¹⁰ and further in view of Cosatto et al. and further in view of Lee et al. and further in view of Kirksey et al. (U.S. Patent 5,938,447A).

Claims 14-15, 43-44 and 72-73 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Johnson et al.³⁸³ in view of Johnson et al.⁹¹⁰ and further in view of Cosatto et al. and further in view of Lee et al. and further in view of Kirksey et al. and further in view of Skelly (U.S. Patent 6,064,383).

Claims 88, 90 and 92 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Johnson et al.³⁸³ in view of Johnson et al.⁹¹⁰ and further in view of Cosatto et al. and further in view of Lee et al.

During the February 27, 2004 Examiner Interview, the Examiner recognized that the pending claims, as amended, appear patentably distinct from the art of record. Applicants respectfully submit that independent claims 1, 30, 59, 88, 90, and 92, as amended, are distinguishable over the cited art, and therefore allowable. In addition, Applicants respectfully submit that the dependent claims which depend from these independent claims, directly or indirectly, are also allowable over the cited art for at least the same reasons and because of the further features they define.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1-15, 30-44, 59-73, 88, 90 and 92 under §103(a) is respectfully requested.

Serial No. 09/709,659
Amendment/Response dated March 1, 2004
In response to the Office Action dated December 30, 2003

Docket No. 4056-4000


CONCLUSION

For these reasons, it is believed that all of the claims as presently presented, are patentable, and that this application is now in allowable condition.

While Applicants believe no extension of time is required, should an additional extension of time be required to render this filing timely, such extension is hereby petitioned. The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be due, or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 13-4500, Order No. 4056-4000. **A DUPLICATE COPY OF THIS SHEET IS ENCLOSED.**

Respectfully submitted,
MORGAN & FINNEGAN, L.L.P.

Dated: March 1, 2004

By: 
Robert M. Pollaro
Registration No. 45,019

Correspondence Address:
MORGAN & FINNEGAN, L.L.P.
345 Park Avenue
New York, NY 10154-0053
(212) 758-4800 Telephone
(212) 751-6849 Facsimile